

REMARKS

The Office Action dated July 24, 2008 has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 25, 33 and 41 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. Claims 1-24 were previously cancelled. No new matter has been added and no new issues are raised which require further consideration or search. Therefore, claims 25-60 are currently pending in the application and are respectfully submitted for consideration.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejected claims 25-32 and 49-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office Action alleged that claims 25-32 and 49-52 disclose a “computer readable medium,” and that this disclosure constitutes new matter. The Office Action further alleged that there is no description, specific or otherwise, of a computer readable medium that would reasonably convey to one skill in the art that Applicants, at the time of the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

In the “Response to Arguments” section of the Office Action, the Office Action indicated that “Examiner does not follow how the disclosure of a non-limiting

embodiment described in relation to ‘SIP signaling in a 3G IMS mobile communication network’ would reasonably convey a computer readable medium to one skilled in the art. (See Office Action at page 2). However, Applicants respectfully submit that a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art would readily understand that SIP signaling is achieved in accordance with Session Initiation Protocol. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the relevant art would readily understand that a signaling protocol, such as Session Initiation Protocol, comprises a computer readable code on a computer memory, wherein a computer memory is an example of a computer readable medium.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 24-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Chung et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0078153) (“Chung”). Applicants respectfully submit that said claims recite allowable subject matter for at least the following reasons.

Claim 25, upon which claims 26-32 are dependent, recites a computer readable medium encoded with a computer code for performing a method when run on a computer. The method includes transmitting from a first terminal to a conference server a first message including a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call. The method further includes receiving by the first terminal from the server a second message including a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the

conference call which has been allocated by the server. The method further includes transmitting from the first terminal to at least one other terminal a third message comprising the network address, where the third message including the network address is transmitted from the first terminal to the at least one other terminal by either direct communication or communication via the conference server.

Claim 33, upon which claims 34-40 are dependent, recites a method, which includes transmitting from a first terminal to a conference server a first message including a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call. The method further includes receiving by the first terminal from the server a second message including a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call which has been allocated by the server. The method further includes transmitting from the first terminal to at least one other terminal a third message including the network address, where the third message including the network address is transmitted from the first terminal to the at least one other terminal by either direct communication or communication via the conference server.

Claim 41, upon which claims 42-48 are dependent, recites an apparatus, which includes a transmitter configured to transmit to a conference server a first message including a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call. The apparatus further includes a receiver configured to receive from the conference server a second message including a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call which has been allocated by the server. The transmitter is further

configured to transmit to at least one terminal a third message including the network address. The third message including the network address is transmitted from the first terminal to the at least one other terminal by either direct communication or communication via the conference server.

As will be discussed below, Chung fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claims, and therefore fails to provide the features discussed above.

Chung generally discloses a method and system including a client server architecture with a centralized process for controlling communications access, and a plurality of client applications each located with an end user for control. Each end user has a device for effecting the communications which may be combined with or operated separately from the client application controlling the communications session. (See Chung at Abstract).

Applicants respectfully submit that Chung fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, all of the elements of the present claims. For example, Chung fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, at least, *“wherein the third message comprising the network address is transmitted from the first terminal to the at least one other terminal by either direct communication or communication via the conference server,”* as recited in independent claims 25 and 33, and similarly recited in independent claim 41.

Chung discloses two embodiments for setting up a conference call using the system including a client server architecture with a centralized process for controlling communications access, and a plurality of client applications each located with an end

user for control, discussed above. As will be discussed below, neither embodiment of Chung teaches a system where the third message may be transmitted by either direct communication or communication via the conference server. Instead, Chung merely teaches that a message may be transmitted only by communication via the communication controller.

In the first embodiment, a SEC client associated with User A sends an invitation message to a communication controller 114. The communications controller 114 selects a communications server to be used in the conference, and notifies the server selected that a new conference has been created. The communications controller 114 then sends a redirection message to the SEC client 170 associated with User A. The redirection message includes a conference ID of the new conference and the encrypted conference session key. The SEC client 170 associated with User A then sends a second invitation message to communications controller 114. The communications controller 114 then sends a join message to the selected communications server indicating that User A is joining the new conference. In response, the selected communications server confirms that User A has joined the new conference, and sends an acknowledgment message to the communications controller 114. (See Chung at paragraphs 0070-0081).

Thus, in the first embodiment, the SEC client 170 associated with User A only sends a message to the communications server via the communications controller 114, and does not send a message to the communications server using a direct connection.

Furthermore, in the second embodiment, the SEC client associated with User A sends an invitation message to the communications controller 114. The communications controller 114 sends a second invitation message to the SEC client 172 associated with User B. Upon User B accepting the invitation, the SEC client 172 associated with User B sends a response message to communications controller 114 indicating that User B has agreed to join the conference. Upon receiving the response message, the communications controller 114 sends a join message to the communications server assigned to the conference indicating that User B is joining the conference. (See Chung at paragraphs 0083-0091).

Thus, in the second embodiment embodiment, the SEC client 170 associated with User A only sends a message to the SEC client 172 associated with User B via communications controller 114, and does not send a message to User B using direct connection.

Thus, the system in Chung cannot provide for transmitting the third message *from the first terminal to the at least one other terminal by either direct communication or communication via the conference server*, as recited in independent claims 25, 33, and 41, because Chung merely provides transmitting a message from User A to User B via communications controller 114, and does not also provide for direct communication between User A and User B.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Chung fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, all of the elements of independent claims 25, 33, and 41. For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 26-32 depend upon independent claim 25. Claims 34-40 depend upon independent claim 33. Claims 42-48 depend upon independent claim 41. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 26-32, 34-40, and 42-48 should be allowed for at least their dependence upon independent claims 25, 33, and 41, respectively, and for the specific elements recited therein.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action further rejected claims 49-60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Chung, in view of Gourraud (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0037406) (“Gourraud”). The Office Action took the position that Chung discloses all the elements of the claims with the exception of “wherein the network address is a dynamically generated uniform resource identifier.” The Office Action then cited Gourraud as allegedly curing the deficiencies of Chung. The rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons. Applicants respectfully submit that said claims recite allowable subject matter for at least the following reasons.

Claim 49, upon which claims 50-52 are dependent, recites a computer readable medium encoded with a computer code for performing a method when run on a computer. The method includes receiving from a first terminal a first message including

a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call. The method further includes allocating a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call. The method further includes transmitting to the first terminal a second message including the network address that identifies the resource capable of sustaining the conference call, where the network address is a dynamically generated uniform resource identifier.

Claim 53, upon which claims 54-56 are dependent, recites a method, which includes receiving from a first terminal a first message including a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call. The method further includes allocating a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call. The method further includes transmitting to the first terminal a second message including the network address that identifies the resource capable of sustaining the conference call, where the network address is a dynamically generated uniform resource identifier.

Claim 57, upon which claims 58-60 are dependent, recites an apparatus, which includes a receiver configured to receive from a first terminal a first message including a request for a resource capable of sustaining a conference call. The apparatus further includes an allocation unit configured to allocate a network address identifying a resource capable of sustaining the conference call. The apparatus further includes a transmitter configured to transmit to the first terminal a second message including the network address that identifies the resource capable of sustaining the conference call, where the network address is a dynamically generated uniform resource identifier.

As will be discussed below, the combination of Chung and Gourraud fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claims, and therefore fails to provide the features discussed above.

The description of Chung, as described above, is incorporated herein. Gourraud generally discloses a method and system for exchanging instant messages among participants to a conference call, wherein when an instant message is to be sent among the participants, the instant message is addressed by a first participant to the conference call itself. An Application Server (AS) receives the message and based on a memory-stored correspondence between the conference call URI and the conference call participants, translates the session URI into Public Ids, SIP URIs, or any other identifier of each participant. The AS further relays the instant message to the other participants by addressing it to each participant's identifier. The memory of the AS is updated as new participants join or leave the conference call, so as to reflect the participants currently involved in the conference call. (See Chung at Abstract).

Applicants respectfully submit that Chung and Gourraud, whether considered individually or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest, all of the elements of the present claims. For example, the combination of Chung and Gourraud fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, at least, *"wherein the network address is a dynamically generated uniform resource identifier,"* as recited in independent claims 49, 53, and 57.

As the Office Action correctly concludes, Chung fails to disclose, or suggest, the aforementioned limitation of independent claims 49, 53, and 57. Furthermore, Gourraud

does not cure the deficiencies of Chung. The Office Action took the position that paragraph 0024 of Gourraud discloses the aforementioned limitation of independent claims 49, 53, and 57. As will be discussed below in more detail, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action is incorrect, as Gourraud teaches the dynamic updating of the association of the uniform resource identifier to the conference participants, as opposed to the dynamic generation of the uniform resource identifier.

Specifically, Gourraud discloses that a memory 214 of an AS 208 stores the correspondence between a conference call URI 402 and the identities of the participants to the conference call. (See Gourraud at paragraph 0036). Gourraud further discloses that when UE A 202 and UE B 204 are engaged in a conference call identified by a conference call Uniform Resource Identifier, the AS 208 stores the conference URI and the identity of each participant to the conference call, in a memory 214. At a given point in time during the same conference call, UE C joins the conference call. The memory 214 of AS 208 is updated so as to reflect that the conference URI is not associated to three participants (i.e. UE A, UE B, and UE C). (See Gourraud at paragraphs 0027-0028). Thus, there is no disclosure, or suggestion, of dynamically generating the uniform resource identifier after each party enters the conference call.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, the combination of Chung and Gourraud fails to disclose, teach, or suggest, all of the elements of independent claims 49, 53, and 57. For the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 50-52 depend upon independent claim 49. Claims 54-56 depend upon independent claim 53. Claims 58-60 depend upon independent claim 57. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 50-52, 54-56, and 58-60 should be allowed for at least their dependence upon independent claims 49, 53, and 57, and for the specific elements recited therein.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art references fail to disclose or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention. These distinctions are more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unanticipated and unobvious. It is therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 25-60 be allowed, and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicant's undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Mullervy
Registration No. 62,382

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

KMM:skl:sew

Enclosures: Petition for Extension of Time
Check No. 20159 (\$490.00)